

[EPA “Report Card”]

Mr. Administrator, thank you for joining us today.

West Virginians love our clean water. We love our clean air. We love our mountains and our forests.

However, your predecessor requested hundreds of millions of taxpayer dollars to spend on regulations, rules, and lawyers.

Regulations that have been extremely detrimental to West Virginia.

Rules that would make electricity more expensive.

Lawyers that would expand the EPA’s reach and impose unrealistic standards on our communities.

Over the past six years, we lost over 10,000 good-paying coal jobs in West Virginia.

I’d like to applaud your leadership and your commitment to refocus the agency on its core missions.

If you wouldn’t mind, could you briefly give us a status update on some of these regulations?

- 1) The Clean Power Plan, which picked “winners and losers” in the electric market and mandated unachievable emissions standards for American power plants.

On this committee, we added riders to prohibit the EPA from implementing the Clean Power Plan.

Even the Supreme Court correctly halted the plan’s implementation in February 2016.

What is the status of the administration’s efforts to roll back this misguided, costly plan?

- 2) The Waters of the US rule, which would overhaul the permitting process, creating uncertainty and harming miners and farmers.

For the past two years, we’ve included a provision in our bill to halt the use of funds on WOTUS.

Thirteen states sued to block the rule, and the rule has been stayed by a federal judge.

- 3) The 2015 ozone standards, which will have major impacts on domestic manufacturing, agricultural, drilling, and mining operations?

Here on the Committee, we adopted an amendment I

offered that barred the EPA from moving the goalposts and implementing new standards until 85 percent of counties in nonattainment comply with the 2008 standards.

- 4) The Mercury rule (“MATS”), which provides very little direct health benefits while requiring power plants to adopt costly upgrades?

The Supreme Court obviously took issue with the rule, and required the EPA to look at the jobs impact and cost associated with the rules it issues.